

REMARKS

This paper is filed in response to the office action dated August 26, 2010, in the above-referenced application. This paper is timely filed as it is accompanied by a petition for extension of time and authorization to charge our credit card account in the amount of the requisite fee. The Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith to our Deposit Account No. 13-2855, under Order No. 29610/CDT496.

Claims 1-44 are pending in this application, but claims 12-19, 33-39, and 42-44 have been withdrawn. By the foregoing, claims 1, 3, and 8-10 have been amended and claims 5, 7, 20-32, 40, and 41 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer. Additionally, new claim 44 has been added. Support for the amendments to claim 1 may be found, for example, in Figure 1 and the description thereof on pages 2-4 of the application and in canceled claim 20. The other amendments are substantially directed to matters of form. Support for new claim 44 may be found, for example, in original claim 1. Support for new claim 45 may be found, for example, on page 11 of the application. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-4, 6, and 8-11 remain at issue.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1-11, 20-32, 40, and 41 have been rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as assertedly anticipated by or obvious over WO 01/41229 to Duineveld et al. ("Duineveld") alone or in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,630,274 to Kiguchi et al. ("Kiguchi"). The rejections are respectfully traversed as applied to claims 1-4, 6, and 8-11 as amended.

Duineveld discloses two separate and distinct arrangements for an organic electroluminescent device.

Figure 1 of Duineveld illustrates an arrangement in which a relief pattern 7 forms elongate channels containing the fluid layers rather than wells as recited in claims 1-4, 6, and 8-11. Stripes of electroluminescent material are deposited in these channels by a spin-coating method. The pixels illustrated by the shaded areas in Figure 1 are defined by the overlapping regions of the row electrodes 3 and the column electrodes 6. In contrast, claims 1-4, 6, and 8-11 recite distinct wells in which

molecular electronic material dissolved in solvent is deposited using a droplet deposition technique. Embodiments 1 to 3 described on pages 16 to 21 of Duineveld utilize the device structure illustrated in Figure 1. Again, this is for a relief pattern which forms channels rather than wells. Furthermore, this is for spin-coating as is clearly stated at, for example, the last paragraph on page 20 of Duineveld.

Figure 3 of Duineveld illustrates an arrangement comprising a composite relief pattern 27 having a first relief pattern 28 forming wells and a second relief pattern 29 forming channels for containing the fluid layers. This structure is described as Embodiment 4 on pages 21 and 22 of Duineveld. The first relief pattern 28 forming the wells is described as having a positive slope (its base being broader than its top). Duineveld is silent about the bank angle and there is certainly no disclosure that the bank angle should be greater than the contact angle of the droplet deposited composition and the bank face. Furthermore, Duineveld is silent about the height of the first relief pattern 28 which forms the wells.

Embodiment 5 described from page 22 of D1 suggests that the fluid layers in the arrangement illustrated in Figure 1 could be inkjet-printed rather than spin-coated. Examples are illustrated in Figures 6, 7, and 8 and on pages 24 and 25 of Duineveld. Figure 6 uses a relief pattern defining channels which are 20 micrometers in height; this height is too high. Figure 7 uses a relief pattern defining channels which are 1.5 micrometers in height; this height described as too small. Figure 9 uses a relief pattern defining channels which are 5.4 micrometers. This height was found to produce good films when formed in a stripe using the channel arrangement.

Thus, Duineveld specifically teaches away from using a low height as in claims 1-4, 6, and 8-11. Moreover, the present inventors have surprisingly found that when using wells instead of channels to deposit a bi-layer device comprising an organic hole transport layer and an organic electroluminescent layer deposited by a droplet deposition technique, a lower height of bank produces better films. Indeed, the present inventors have found that the combination of a large bank angle and a low bank height (less than 2 micrometers) produces the best films when an organic hole transport layer and an organic electroluminescent layer are ink-jet printed into wells. The aforementioned features are neither disclosed nor suggested in Duineveld.

Kiguchi does not overcome the foregoing deficiencies. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be sustained.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the examiner wish to discuss the foregoing, or any matter of form or procedure in an effort to advance this application to allowance, the examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

December 27, 2010

/Andrew M. Lawrence/

Andrew M. Lawrence, Reg. No. 46,130

Attorney for Applicant

6300 Willis Tower

233 S. Wacker Drive

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300